

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **1.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

#### **A. Claims 1-12, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23 and 31**

Claims 1-12, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggert, *et al.* (NPL Publication "Host Identity Protocol Rendezvous Mechanism") in view of Valli, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0160183). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that the present invention pre-dates the Eggert reference. The attached Declaration of Petri Jokela, an inventor of the present application shows that the present invention was conceived at least before November 24, 2003, which was the date that Petri Jokela signed the invention disclosure form. As such, the present invention pre-dates February 5, 2004, which is the publication date of the Eggert reference.

In view of the above, the combination of Eggert and Valli fails since the Eggert reference does not qualify as prior art. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 31 are now in condition for allowance.

#### **B. Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18**

Claims 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggert, *et al.* in view of Valli, *et al.* and further in view of Wall (NPL Publication "Integrating Security, Mobility, and Multi-homing in a HIP Way"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As stated above in Section 1.) A., the Eggert reference does not qualify as prior art. As such, the combination of Eggert, Valli and Wall fails to teach what is recited in claims 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 are now in condition for allowance.

C. Claim 21

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggert, *et al.* and Valli, *et al.* and further in view of Lim (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0057662). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As stated above in Section 1.) A., the Eggert reference does not qualify as prior art. As such, the combination of Eggert, Valli and Lim fails to teach what is recited in claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is now in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Bethea, Jr  
Registration No. 53,987

Date: March 9, 2010

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4859  
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com